REMARKS

In the Office Action,[1] the Examiner rejected claims 9-12, 15-18, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,289,314 to Matsuzaki et al. ("*Matsuzaki*"); rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki*; rejected claims 19-24, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,412 to Christiano ("*Christiano*"); and rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki* in view of *Christiano*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,124 to Shimakawa et al. ("*Shimakawa*").

In the Amendment After Final filed March 6, 2007, Applicant asserted that *Matsuzaki* does not teach the information processing apparatus of claim 9 comprising "usage details including how said contents can be reproduced or duplicated, and whether control transfer is possible." See Amendment After Final, page 3. In response, the Examiner noted in the Advisory Action mailed March 27, 2007: "applicant mentions that 'usage details' contains ID, Type, Paremeter [*sic*], and Control Transfer Permission Information. However, the claim language simply states usage details that includes how to reproduce and whether transfer is possible. Figure 5 of Matsuzaki teaches this broader limitation." See Advisory Action, page 2.

Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner, to advance prosecution, Applicant amends claims 9, 11, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 to recite "usage

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

details comprising a type including how said contents can be reproduced or duplicated and control transfer permission information including whether control transfer is possible, said type being one of purchase and reproduce, first generation duplicate, limited-time reproduction, pay per copy, or pay per play, and said control transfer permission information being one of permitted or not permitted." The amendments to the claims are supported by the specification at, for example, pages 28 and 46.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9-12, 15-18, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Matsuzaki*. *Matsuzaki* fails to disclose each and every element of Applicant's claims.

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites an information processing apparatus including, for example, "usage details comprising a type . . . , said type being one of purchase and reproduce, first generation duplicate, limited-time reproduction, pay per copy, or pay per play." *Matsuzaki* does not teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 9.

The Examiner states, "the screen size and installation place [of *Matsuzaki*] determine how the contents can be reproduced." See Office Action, page 3. However, *Matsuzaki* does not teach or suggest that the screen size and the installation place can be "one of purchase and reproduce, first generation duplicate, limited-time reproduction, pay per copy, or pay per play," as recited in claim 9. For at least this reason, *Matsuzaki* fails to anticipate claim 9.

Independent claims 11, 17, 27, and 28, although different in scope than claim 9, are not anticipated by *Matsuzaki* for at least the same reasons independent claim 9 is not anticipated by *Matsuzaki*. In addition, Applicant submits that dependent claims 10,

12, 15, 16, and 18 are also not anticipated by *Matsuzaki* at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims 9, 11, or 17. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9-12, 15-18, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Matsuzaki* should be withdrawn.

The remaining rejections in the Office Action (rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki*; rejection of claims 19-24, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki* in view of *Christiano*; and rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzaki* in view of *Christiano*, and further in view of *Shimakawa*) all depend on *Matsuzaki*, and should be withdrawn in view of the above discussion. *Matsuzaki* fails to teach or suggest "usage details comprising a type . . . , said type being one of purchase and reproduce, first generation duplicate, limited-time reproduction, pay per copy, or pay per play," as recited or similarly recited in independent claims 9, 11, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 31, and required by dependent claims 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 25.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 9, 2007

By: _____
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921